IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 4 and 11. These sheets, which include Figs. 4 and 11, replace the original sheets including Figs. 4 and 11.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets: 2

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-100 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 21, 70, and 99 are amended. No claims are cancelled or newly added. The specification and drawings are amended. Support for the amendments to Claim 21, 70, and 99 can be found at page 21, lines 3-17 and in original Claim 1, for example. Support for the amendments the specification and drawings is self-evident. No new matter is added.

In the Office Action, the Applicants' claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) based upon application number 2001-185475, filed in Japan on 6/19/2000 (sic.) was denied; the declaration was noted as defective; the drawings were objected to; Claims 1-10, 12-25, 37-59, 61-74, and 86-100 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Haneda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,563, hereafter, "Haneda") in view of Underwood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,397,023, hereafter, "Underwood "); Claims 11, 26-34, 36, 60, 75-83, and 85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Haneda and Underwood as applied to Claims 10, 21, 59, and 70 above, and further in view of Okomoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,257,064); and Claims 35 and 84 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Haneda in view of Underwood, and further in view of Taruki (U.S. Patent No. 5,839,044, hereafter, "Taruki").

Regarding the denial of the request for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d), Applicants respectfully submit the filing date of the Application JP2001-185475 is June 19, 2001 and not June 19, 2000. The original ADS, filed on July 27, 2001, incorrectly listed the filing date of the priority document. The supplemental ADS, filed on May 6, 2002, corrected the listed filing date of JP2001-185475 to state, "June 19, 2001." Thus, Applicants respectfully submit the claim of priority to the June 19, 2005, filing date of JP2001-185475 is

proper, and Applicants respectfully request that priority to the JP2001-185475, filing date of June 19, 2001, be granted.

Regarding the rejection of the Oath/Declaration, that rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully submit that the Declaration filed on November 2, 2001, fully complies with each of the sections of 37 CFR § 1.67(a) cited in the outstanding Office Action. A courtesy copy of the Declaration filed on November 2, 2001, is enclosed.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, replacement drawing sheets amending Figs. 4 and 11 as suggested by the Examiner are submitted herewith. Additionally, to conform to the language of the specification, Fig. 4 now correctly includes the reference number 5R, and the reference numbers 99 and 100c are added to Fig. 11. Further, the specification is amended to correct a typographical error that resulted in the omission of reference number 7c show in Fig. 2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the drawings is overcome.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-10, 12-25, 37-59, 61-74, and 86-100 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Haneda in view of Underwood, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response on the grounds that no reasonable combination of Haneda with Underwood disclose all of the features of any of amended independent Claims 1, 21, 50, 70, or 99

Some background image forming devices capable of performing double-sided copying typically apply toner to one side of a recording sheet and then mechanically flip the recording sheet to apply toner to the other side of the recording sheet. Thus, multiple steps are required to apply images to both sides of a recording sheet, and the image forming apparatus production speed is reduced.

Other background image forming devices simultaneously apply images to both sides of the recording sheet. However, when multiple output trays are available for depositing the

finished recording sheets with double-sided copies, these background image forming devices may not be able to deposit the finished sheets in proper page order. When the recording sheets receive an image on both sides and are transferred straight through the image forming apparatus to an output tray located on a side of the image forming device, the sheets will be deposited in the "face-down" position in the output tray. In contrast, however, when finished recording sheets are deposited in a tray on top of the image forming device, the recording sheet typically travels through a path that mechanically reverses the orientation of the recording sheet from a "face-down" position to a "face-up" position. Thus, if the same recording method is used for sheets intended to be deposited in the tray on the top of the image forming device as is used for the sheets to be deposited in the tray on the side of the image forming device, the recording sheets will be deposited in the output tray on top of the image forming device in the wrong order. Thus, a mechanical "flipping" step is required to correct the orientation of any sheet to be deposited in the tray on the top of the image forming device.

In light of these difficulties, Applicants developed the present invention. For example, Claim 1 recites, in part:

> a sheet transferring mechanism configured to transfer said at least one recording sheet to a nip formed between said first and second image carrying members, wherein said first image carrying member is configured to transfer a first image of said at least one image to a first surface of said at least one recording sheet and, said second image carrying member is configured to transfer a second image of said at least one image to a second surface of said at least one recording sheet in response to a selection of either said first ejection tray or said second ejection tray in a double-sided recording mode so that either said first ejection tray or said second ejection tray stacks said at least one recording sheet in increasing order of page numbers, and the recording sheet follows a same transporting path to the selected ejection tray as the recording sheet follows in a single-sided recording mode.

Accordingly, Claim 1 recites a first ejection tray and a second ejection tray wherein **images are transferred to the recording sheet in response to a selection of either the first or**

second ejection tray, and the recording sheets are deposited in increasing page order. Additionally, **the recording sheet follows the same transporting path in the double-sided recording mode as it does in the single-sided recording mode.** Amended independent Claims 21, 50, 70, and 99 each recite substantially similar features.

In contrast, no reasonable combination of Haneda with Underwood includes a plurality of ejection trays wherein the recording sheets are deposited in one of the plurality of ejection trays in an increasing order of page numbers, the images are transferred to the recording sheet based on a selection of one of the plurality of recording trays, and the recording sheet follows the same path to one of a plurality of ejection trays in both the double-sided and single-sided recording modes.

As indicated in the outstanding Office Action, Haneda does not disclose a plurality of output trays.[1] Thus, as Haneda describes only one output tray, Haneda cannot have a path to a non-existent additional output tray. Therefore, Haneda describes only a single path for the recording sheet to travel to a single tray and fails to disclose a plurality of trays such that the path to each tray is the same regardless of whether the recording mode selected is double-sided or single-sided.

The outstanding Office Action relies on Underwood to provide a plurality of ejection trays. However, Applicants respectfully submit that Underwood does not disclose that the path through which the recording sheet travels to each of the ejection trays is the same in both the single-sided and double-sided recording modes. Rather, as shown in Figs. 2 and 3, when Underwood places a sheet with an image formed only **on a single side** into tray (20), Underwood simply moves the sheet along the path defined by segments (24A)-(24B)-(14)-(24C)-(24E).

When Underwood places a sheet with an image formed on **both sides** into tray (20),

[1] Outstanding Office Action, page 6.

Underwood must move the sheet along the path including all of segments (24A)-(24B)-(14)-(24C)-(24F)(24G)-(24H)-(24I). Additionally, Underwood must move the sheet through segments (24B)-(14)-(24C) a second time. After the sheet passes through all of these segments, the sheet passes through segment (24E) and comes to a rest in the ejection tray (20). Even after passing through all of these segments, the sheet will be in the "face-up" position in the ejection tray (20). In other words, if two double-sided sheets are stacked in the tray (20), page 1 of the stack will face toward the stack rather than away from the stack. Accordingly, to have the sheet with images formed on two sides stacked in proper order in tray (20), Underwood would transport the sheet through the above-described path yet another time. Thus, it is clear that Underwood fails to disclose a plurality of trays such that the path to each tray is the same regardless of whether the recording mode selected is double-sided or single-sided.

Accordingly, no reasonable combination of Haneda with Underwood includes a plurality of ejection trays wherein the recording sheets are deposited in one of the plurality of ejection trays in an increasing order of page numbers, the images are transferred to the recording sheet based on a selection of one of the plurality of recording trays, and the recording sheet follows the same path to one of a plurality of ejection trays in both the double-sided and single-sided recording modes.

Neither Okamoto nor Taruki, cited in rejections of dependent claims, remedy the above-discussed deficiencies in Haneda and Underwood. Rather, both Okamoto and Taruki describe image forming devices with only a single ejection tray, and, therefore, suffer from at least the same deficiencies as Haneda.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1, 21, 50, 70, and 99 patentably distinguish over all of the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

All of Claims 2-20, 22-49, 51-69, 71-98, and 100 depend, directly or indirectly, from one of Claims 1, 21, 50, 70, and 99 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claims 1, 21, 50, 70, and 99.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)